## REMARKS

Claims 11-30 remain in this application.

The examiner stated that claim 29 contains allowable subject matter, therefore claim 29 has been amended to make it independent by incorporating the language of claim 11.

The examiner has indicated, in paragraph 7 of the Office action, that Krutzsch et al teaches converting a hydrogen producing fluid (water, methanol or HC) by a chemical conversion into a second auxiliary agent, storing the secondary agent in reservoir 6, and at least intermittently delivering the second agent to the exhaust line. This is not the same as recited in claim 11, in that claim 11 recites delivering a first agent to the exhaust gas, subjecting **the first agent to a chemical conversion to make a second agent**, storing a quantity of the second agent, and delivering the second agent to the exhaust. In the teaching of Krutzsch et al, a first agent is never converted to a second agent. HC generator 5 creates the first agent. $H_2$ generator 6 creates the second agent. And the first agent is never, in any way, converted to the second agent under the teachings of Krutzsch et al.

Stated another way, although Krutzsch et al shows a method and apparatus of reducing the nitrogen oxides in the exhaust gasses of an engine, the reference to Krutzsch et al lacks a teaching of **the second auxiliary agent being chemically converted from the first auxiliary agent and then the second auxiliary agent is stored in an intermediate reservoir** for later delivery to the exhaust gas separate from the first auxiliary agent being delivered to the exhaust gas.

The Krutzsch reference merely shows a process and method for reducing nitrogen oxides

wherein one of HC or hydrogen is added to the exhaust gases.

The examiner has made an argument, in paragraph 8 of the Office action, that Krutzsch et al teaches a variety of options used by hydrogen generator(6) to generate hydrogen gases. But this very broad statement in Krutzsch et al at column 2 lines 56-60 does not include any statement, or other indication whatsoever, of providing that the second, auxiliary agent, $H_2$, is derived from the first agent, as is recited in claim 11. Nor does the recitation in Krutzsch et al include any mention of an intermediate reservoir for the second, auxiliary agent, as also recited in claim 11.

The examiner has indicated, at the top of page 3 of the action, that element 6 of Krutzsch et al is a reservoir for $H_2$, but nowhere in Krutzsch et al is there any mention of element 6 being a storage means. Krutzsch et al never recite that element 6 is anything other than a generator for $H_2$.

The examiner has applied Akama et al in an effort to fill the deficiencies of Krutzsch et al. But Akama et al does not teach using a first agent, and then also converting a portion of this first agent to a second agent, with or without intermittently supplying the second agent to the exhaust line. Akama et al apply only one agent to the exhaust line, and thus does not teach anything like the recitations of claim 11, wherein **a first reducing agent is converted to a second reducing agent, and these two agents are used as appropriate** for posttreatment of the exhaust gas of an internal combustion engine.

And the secondary reference to Akama et al is a special case designed for particular engines in which the operating temperature of the engine never reaches above $250^0$ C. Thus, it

is not appropriate to consider the reference to Akama et al as a reference which teaches anything relevant to the engine of Krutzsch et al, as the engines of these two references operate under entirely different conditions. Particularly, the engine of Akama et al never reaches to normal operating conditions of the engine of Krutzsch et al.

Further, the Krutzsch et al reference lacks features which are particularly advantageous to the present invention, and are specifically recited in others of the claims. Claim 13 requires the conversion of the first auxiliary agent into a second auxiliary agent only during a normal operating mode of the motor vehicle so that for the next cold start of the engine the required amount of second auxiliary agent will already be available. The Krutzsch et al reference does not teach producing $H_2$ only during a normal operating mode of the engine, as recited in claim 13.

Since the Krutzsch et al reference lacks an intermediate reservoir, there is no way that this reference can be relied on to teach that such reservoir is dimensioned such that the quantity of second auxiliary agent stored in it suffices to assure removal of nitric oxides from the exhaust gas under special vehicle conditions, during which special conditions the first auxiliary agent would not achieve sufficiently adequate removal of nitric oxides, as recited in claim 17.

It is also particularly advantageous to perform the chemical conversion only until the intermediate reservoir is full, as this assures economical use of any electrical energy that may be needed, as recited in claims 14-16.

Furthermore, neither of Krutzsch et al or Akama et al teach anything whatsoever to do with converting ammonia to or from another agent as recited in claims 21-28.

Thus, none of the prior art cited and applied by the examiner teaches or makes obvious the method as recited in claims 11-28, or the structure recited in claim 30 of this application.

For the above reasons, entry of the amendment and allowance of the claims are courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald E. Greigg
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,517
Customer No. 02119

GREIGG & GREIGG, P.L.L.C.
1423 Powhatan Street, Suite One
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 838-5500
Fax. (703) 838-5554

REG/SLS

J:\Bosch\R304250\Reply to 8-24-06 FINAL OA.wpd